

REMARKS

I. Status Of The Claims

Claims 1-23 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Powell (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0073167).

Claims 1-5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marks (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,447).

Claims 6-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marks in view of Willis (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,647).

Claims 1, 6, 14, 18, 21, and 23 are independent.

With this response claims 1, 6, 14, 18, 21, and 23 are amended. No new matter has been added.

II. Rejections of Independent Claims 1, 6, 14, 18, 21, and 23

The Office Action rejects independent claims 1, 6, 14, 18, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Powell, rejects independent claims 1 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marks, and rejects independent claims 6, 14, 18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Marks and Willis.

Turning to the rejection of independent claims 1, 6, 14, 18, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Powell, Applicants respectfully submit that Powell fails, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... sending the data over the multicast channel to one or more client devices”

as set forth in each of claims 1 and 6 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

As another example, Powell fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... sending the selected data over the multicast channel to one or more client devices”

as set forth in each of claims 14, 18, and 21 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

As yet another example, Powell fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... wherein said cache includes data sent to one or more client devices of multicast groups ...”

as set forth in claim 23 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

Turning to the rejection of independent claim 1 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marks, Applicants respectfully submit that Marks fails, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... selecting data to be sent to multicast groups based on a predetermined policy ...”

as set forth in claim 1 (emphasis added).

As another example, Marks fails to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... wherein said cache includes data sent to one or more client devices of multicast groups, wherein the sent data was selected based on a predetermined policy”

as set forth in claim 23 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

The Office Action argues that such is disclosed among column 8 lines 43-67 of

Marks:

“... the middleware server getting information out of the database sever and reports to the proxy server the associated user, session privileges, other relevant data ...”
(see Office Action p. 2).

However, Marks fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, for instance, that the “new session IDs”, “associated user and session privileges”, or “other relevant data” are employed in

selecting data to be sent, or that sent data was selected based on those “new session IDs”, “associated user and session privileges”, or “other relevant data” (see Marks, col. 8 ln. 58-60).

Turning to the rejection of independent claims 6, 14, 18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Marks and Willis, Applicants respectfully submit that Marks and Willis, taken individually or in combination, fail, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... selecting data to be sent over a shared multicast channel
based on a predetermined policy ...”

as set forth in claim 6 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

As another example, Marks and Willis, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... selecting data to be sent over a shared multicast channel
based upon said user demand ...”

as set forth in each of claims 14, 18, and 21 (emphasis added).

The Office Action apparently contends that such is disclosed among column 8 lines 43-67 of Marks:

“... the middleware server getting information out of the database sever and reports to the proxy server the associated user, session privileges, other relevant data ...”
(see Office Action p. 2).

However, Marks fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, for instance, that the “new session IDs”, “associated user and session privileges”, or “other relevant data” (see Marks, col. 8 ln. 58-60) are employed in selecting data to be sent.

In view of at least the forgoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 6, 14, 18, 21, and 23, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

III. Dependent Claims

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

V. Authorization

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4041. **A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.**

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any

III. Dependent Claims

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

V. Authorization

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4041. **A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.**

Furthermore, in the event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any

overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 14, 2005

By:



Angus R. Gill
Registration No. 51,133

Mailing Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
(212) 415-8746
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)